REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Eriksson is respectfully traversed, for reasons stated later.

Nevertheless, to avoid any question of applicability of the Eriksson reference to the claims of the present application, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the rigid surface on the lower part is fixed against movement in the downward direction.

As now recited in Claim 1, the rigid surface on the lower part is not only spaced from the upper part, it is fixed against movement in the downward direction, as is apparent in Figs. 5-9 of Applicant's drawings.

The Office has alleged on page 3 of the Office Action, that the "lower part" (spring 16) of Eriksson is spaced from the "upper part" such that the spring legs have room to move relative to the upper part during operation. Such movement is downward movement, as is apparent in Figs. 6-8 of Eriksson, and is the antithesis of Applicant's invention. In fact, if the spring legs of Eriksson could not move in the downward direction, the Eriksson device would be

inoperative, because members 4 would be prevented from turning.

Accordingly, Claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon clearly distinguish patentably from Eriksson and should be allowed.

Furthermore, referring again to Applicant's earlier stated traversal of the rejection based on Eriksson, the assertion on page 3 of the Office Action, namely, that the lower part surfaces where the bending devices are specifically contacting do not bend and remain stiff, is inaccurate. Since the complete spring is made from the same material and has the same dimensions, the contacting surface parts will inevitably bend somewhat, even if most of the bending action is in the corners of the spring. The surface of the spring contacted by members 4 is not a rigid surface, as required by Claim 1.

This application is believed to be clearly in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to

Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (XA-10592) any fees under 37

C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper

and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any

extension of time is required in connection with the filing

of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 30, 2009

Nelson H. Shapiro
Reg. No. 17,095

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C. 1751 Pinnacle Drive Suite 500 McLean, Virginia 22102-3833 (703) 903-9000

NHS:ecr